Study of Distributed Conjugate Gradient Strategies for Distributed Estimation Over Sensor Networks

Songcen Xu*, Rodrigo C. de Lamare, *Senior Member, IEEE,* and H. Vincent Poor, *Fellow, IEEE*

arXiv:1601.04102v1 [cs.DC] 16 Jan 2016

Abstract

This paper presents distributed conjugate gradient algorithms for distributed parameter estimation and spectrum estimation over wireless sensor networks. In particular, distributed conventional conjugate gradient (CCG) and modified conjugate gradient (MCG) are considered, together with incremental and diffusion adaptive solutions. The distributed CCG and MCG algorithms have an improved performance in terms of mean square error as compared with least–mean square (LMS)–based algorithms and a performance that is close to recursive least–squares (RLS) algorithms. In comparison with existing centralized or distributed estimation strategies, key features of the proposed algorithms are: 1) more accurate estimates and faster convergence speed can be obtained; 2) the design of preconditioners for CG algorithms, which have the ability to improve the performance of the proposed CG algorithms is presented and 3) the proposed algorithms are implemented in the area of distributed parameter estimation and spectrum estimation. The performance of the proposed algorithms for distributed estimation is illustrated via simulations and the resulting algorithms are distributed, cooperative and able to respond in real time to change in the environment.

Index Terms

Distributed conjugate gradient, distributed parameter estimation, distributed spectrum estimation, wireless sensor networks.

I. Introduction

In recent years, distributed processing has become popular in wireless communication networks. This approach to processing information consists in collecting data at each node of a network of sensing devices spread over a

S. Xu* is with the Communications and Signal Processing Research Group, Department of Electronics, University of York, YO10 5DD York, U.K. (e-mail: songcen.xu@york.ac.uk).

R. C. de Lamare is with CETUC / PUC-Rio, Brazil and Department of Electronics, University of York, U.K. (e-mail: rodrigo.delamare@york.ac.uk).

H. V. Poor is with the Department of Electrical Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton NJ 08544 USA (e-mail: poor@princeton.edu).

Part of this work has been presented at the 2012 Conference on Sensor Signal Processing for Defence, London, UK

geographical area, conveying information to the whole network and performing statistical inference in a distributed way [1]. In this context, for each specific node, a set of neighbor nodes collect their local information and transmit their estimates to a specific node. Then, each specific node combines the collected information together with its local estimate to generate an improved estimate. There are three main protocols for cooperation and exchange of information for distributed processing, incremental, diffusion and consensus strategies, and recent studies indicate that the diffusion strategy is the most effective one [2].

In the last recent years, several algorithms have been developed and reported in the literature for distributed networks. Steepest-descent, least-mean square (LMS) [1], recursive least squares (RLS) [3] and affine projection (AP) [4] solutions have been considered with incremental adaptive strategies over distributed networks [1], while the LMS, AP and recursive least squares (RLS) algorithms have been reported using diffusion adaptive strategies [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13]. Although the LMS–based algorithms have their own advantages, when compared with conjugate gradient (CG) algorithms [14], [15], [16], [17], there are several disadvantages. First, for the LMS–based algorithms, the adaptation speed is often slow, especially for the conventional LMS algorithm. Second, with the increase of the adaptation speed, the system stability may decrease significantly[18]. Furthermore, the RLS–based algorithms usually have a high computational complexity and are prone to numerical instability when implemented in hardware [19]. In order to develop distributed solutions with a more attractive tradeoff between performance and complexity, we focus on the development of distributed CG algorithms. To the best of our knowledge, CG–based algorithms have not been developed so far for distributed processing. The existing standard CG algorithm has a faster convergence rate than the LMS-type algorithms and a lower computational complexity than RLS-type techniques [20] even though its performance is often comparable to RLS algorithms. We consider variants of CG algorithms, including conventional CG (CCG) algorithm and modified CG (MCG) algorithm.

In this paper, we propose distributed CG algorithms for both incremental and diffusion adaptive strategies. In particular, we develop distributed versions of the CCG algorithm and of the MCG algorithm for use in distributed estimation over sensor networks and spectrum estimation. The design of preconditioners for CG algorithms, which have the ability to improve the performance of the proposed CG algorithms is also presented in this paper. These algorithms can be widely used in civilian and defence applications, such as parameter estimation in wireless sensor networks, biomedical engineering, cellular networks, battlefield information identification, movement estimation and detection and distributed spectrum estimation.

In summary, the main contributions of this paper are:

- We present distributed CG–based algorithms for distributed estimation that are able to achieve significantly better performance than existing algorithms.
- We devise distributed CCG and MCG algorithms with incremental and diffusion adaptive solutions to perform distributed estimation.
- We implement the proposed CG–based algorithms in the fields of distributed parameter estimation and spectrum estimation.
- The design of preconditioners for CG algorithms, which have the ability to improve the performance of the proposed CG algorithms is presented.
- A simulation study of the proposed and existing distributed estimation algorithms is conducted along with applications in wireless sensor networks.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II describes the system models. In Section III, the proposed incremental distributed CG–Based algorithms are introduced. We present proposed diffusion distributed CG–Based algorithms in Section IV. The preconditioner design is illustrated in Section V. The numerical simulation results are provided in Section VI. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section VII.

Notation: We use boldface upper case letters to denote matrices and boldface lower case letters to denote vectors. We use $(\cdot)^T$ and $(\cdot)^{-1}$ denote the transpose and inverse operators respectively, $(\cdot)^H$ for conjugate transposition and $(\cdot)^*$ for complex conjugate.

II. System Models

In this section, we describe the system models of two applications of distributed signal processing, namely, parameter estimation and spectrum estimation. In these applications, we consider a wireless sensor network which employs distributed signal processing techniques to perform the desired tasks. We consider a set of N nodes, which have limited processing capabilities, distributed over a given geographical area. The nodes are connected and form a network, which is assumed to be partially connected because nodes can exchange information only with neighbors determined by the connectivity topology. We call a network with this property a partially connected network whereas a fully connected network means that data broadcast by a node can be captured by all other nodes in the network in one hop [21].

A. Distributed Parameter Estimation

For distributed parameter estimation, we focus on the processing of an adaptive algorithm for estimating an unknown vector $\boldsymbol{\omega}_o$ with size $M \times 1$. The desired signal of each node at time instant i is

$$d_k(i) = \boldsymbol{\omega}_0^H \boldsymbol{x}_k(i) + n_k(i), \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, I, \tag{1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{x}_k(i)$ is the $M \times 1$ input signal vector, $n_k(i)$ is the Gaussian noise at each node with zero mean and variance $\sigma_{n,k}^2$. At the same time, the output of the adaptive algorithm for each node is given by

$$y_k(i) = \boldsymbol{\omega}_k^H(i) \boldsymbol{x}_k(i), \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, I, \tag{2}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\omega}_k(i)$ is the local estimate of $\boldsymbol{\omega}_0$ for each node at time instant i.

To compute the optimum solution of the unknown vector, we need to solve a problem expressed in the form of a minimization of the cost function in the distributed form for each node k:

$$J_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_k(i)}\big(\boldsymbol{\omega}_k(i)\big) = \mathbb{E}\big|d_k(i) - \boldsymbol{\omega}_k^H(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k(i)\big|^2 \tag{3}$$

and the global network cost function could be described as

$$J_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\big(\boldsymbol{\omega}\big) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\big|d_k(i) - \boldsymbol{\omega}^H \boldsymbol{x}_k(i)\big|^2. \tag{4}$$

The optimum solution for the cost function (3) is the Wiener solution which is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}_k(i) = \boldsymbol{R}_k^{-1}(i)\boldsymbol{b}_k(i). \tag{5}$$

where the $M \times M$ autocorrelation matrix is given by $\boldsymbol{R}_k(i) = \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{x}_k(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k^H(i)]$ and $\boldsymbol{b}_k(i) = \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{x}_k(i)d_k^*(i)]$ is an $M \times 1$ cross–correlation matrix. In this paper, we focus on incremental and diffusion CG–based algorithms to solve the equation and perform parameter estimation and spectrum estimation in a distributed fashion.

B. Distributed Spectrum Estimation

In distrusted spectrum estimation, we aim to estimate the spectrum of a transmitted signal $\boldsymbol{s}$ with N nodes using a wireless sensor network. Let $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_s(f)$ denote the power spectral density (PSD) of the signal $\boldsymbol{s}$. The PSD can be represented as a linear combination of some $\mathcal{B}$ basis functions, as described by

$$\Phi_s(f) = \sum_{m=1}^{\mathcal{B}} b_m(f)\omega_{0m} = \boldsymbol{b}_0^T(f)\boldsymbol{\omega}_0, \tag{6}$$

where $\boldsymbol{b}_0(f) = [b_1(f), ..., b_{\mathcal{B}}(f)]^T$ is the vector of basis functions evaluated at frequency f, $\boldsymbol{\omega}_0 = [\omega_{01}, ..., \omega_{0\mathcal{B}}]$ is a vector of weighting coefficients representing the power that transmits the signal $\boldsymbol{s}$ over each basis, and $\mathcal{B}$ is the

number of basis functions. For $\mathcal{B}$ sufficiently large, the basis expansion in (6) can well approximate the transmitted spectrum. Possible choices for the set of basis $\{b_m(f)\}_{m=1}^{\mathcal{B}}$ include [22], [23], [24]: rectangular functions, raised cosines, Gaussian bells and Splines.

Let $H_k(f,i)$ be the channel transfer function between a transmit node conveying the signal $\boldsymbol{s}$ and receive node k at time instant i, the PSD of the received signal observed by node k can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} I_k(f,i) &= |H_k(f,i)|^2 \Phi_s(f) + v_{n,k}^2 \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\mathcal{B}} |H_k(f,i)|^2 b_m(f)\omega_{0m} + v_{n,k}^2 \\ &= \boldsymbol{b}_{k,i}^T(f)\boldsymbol{\omega}_0 + v_{n,k}^2 \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\boldsymbol{b}_{k,i}^T(f) = [|H_k(f,i)|^2 b_m(f)]_{m=1}^{\mathcal{B}}$ and $v_{n,k}^2$ is the receiver noise power at node k. For simplification, let us assume that the link between receive node k and the transmit node is perfect and there is no receiver noise at node k.

At every time instant i, every node k observes measurements of the noisy version of the true PSD $I_k(f,i)$ described by (7) over N_c frequency samples $f_j = f_{min} : (f_{max} - f_{min})/N_c : f_{max}$, for $j = 1, ..., N_c$, according to the model:

$$d_k^j(i) = \boldsymbol{b}_{k,i}^T(f_j)\boldsymbol{\omega}_0 + v_{n,k}^2 + n_k^j(i). \tag{8}$$

The term $n_k^j(i)$ denotes observation noise and have zero mean and variance $\sigma_{n,j}^2$. Collecting measurements over N_c contiguous channels, we obtain a linear model given by

$$\boldsymbol{d}_k(i) = \boldsymbol{B}_k(i)\boldsymbol{\omega}_0 + \boldsymbol{n}_k(i), \tag{9}$$

where $\boldsymbol{B}_k(i) = [\boldsymbol{b}_{k,i}^T(f_j)]_{j=1}^{N_c} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_c \times \mathcal{B}}$, with $N_c > \mathcal{B}$, and $\boldsymbol{n}_k(i)$ is a zero mean random vector with covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{R}_{n,i}$. At this point, we can generate the cost function for node k as:

$$J_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_k(i)}(\boldsymbol{\omega}_k(i)) = \mathbb{E}\big|\boldsymbol{d}_k(i) - \boldsymbol{B}_k(i)\boldsymbol{\omega}_k(i)\big|^2 \tag{10}$$

and the global network cost function could be described as

$$J_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\big(\boldsymbol{\omega}\big) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\big|\boldsymbol{d}_k(i) - \boldsymbol{B}_k(i)\boldsymbol{\omega}\big|^2. \tag{11}$$

III. Proposed Incremental Distributed CG–Based Algorithms

In this section, we propose two CG–based algorithms which are based on the CCG [14] and MCG [15] algorithms with incremental distributed solution for distributed parameter estimation and spectrum estimation over wireless

sensor networks. Other reduced-rank techniques [25], [26], [27], [28], [29], [18], [30] and distributed strategies [31] can also be considered. Before we present the proposed incremental distributed CG–Based algorithms, we introduce the basic CG algorithm in detail.

A. The Conjugate Gradient (CG) Algorithm

The CG algorithm is well known for its faster convergence rate than the LMS algorithm and lower computational complexity than the RLS algorithm [20], [32], [14]. In adaptive filtering techniques, the CG algorithm applied to the system $\boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{\omega} = \boldsymbol{b}$, starts with an initial guess of the solution $\boldsymbol{\omega}(0)$, with an initial residual $\boldsymbol{g}(0) = \boldsymbol{b}$, and with an initial search direction that is equal to the initial residual: $\boldsymbol{p}(0) = \boldsymbol{g}(0)$, where $\boldsymbol{R}$ is the correlation or the covariance matrix of the input signal and $\boldsymbol{b}$ is the cross–correlation vector between the desired signal and the input signal.

The strategy for the conjugate gradient method is that at step j, the residual $\boldsymbol{g}(j) = \boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{\omega}(j)$ is orthogonal to the Krylov subspace generated by $\boldsymbol{b}$, and therefore each residual is perpendicular to all the previous residuals. The residual is computed at each step.

The solution at the next step is achieved using a search direction that is only a linear combination of the previous search directions, which for $\boldsymbol{\omega}(1)$ is just a combination between the previous and the current residual.

Then, the solution at step j, $\boldsymbol{\omega}(j)$, could be obtained through $\boldsymbol{\omega}(j-1)$ from the previous iteration plus a step size $\alpha(j)$ times the last search direction. The immediate benefit of the search directions is that there is no need to store the previous search directions. Using the orthogonality of the residuals to these previous search directions, the search is linearly independent of the previous directions. For the solution in the next step, a new search direction is computed, as well as a new residual and new step size. To provide an optimal approximate solution of $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, the step size $\alpha(j)$ is calculated according to [20], [32], [14].

To illustrate the CG algorithm, Fig. 1 shows how the CG algorithm finds the approximate solution to the exact solution. The iterative formulas of the CG algorithm [20], [32], [14] are concluded in Table I.

TABLE I

MAIN STEPS FOR CG ALGORITHM.

– Step size:$\alpha(j) = \frac{\boldsymbol{g}(j-1)^H \boldsymbol{g}(j-1)}{\boldsymbol{p}(j-1)^H \boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{p}(j-1)}$
– Approximate solution: $\boldsymbol{\omega}(j) = \boldsymbol{\omega}(j-1) + \alpha(j)\boldsymbol{p}(j-1)$
– Residual: $\boldsymbol{g}(j) = \boldsymbol{g}(j-1) - \alpha(j)\boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{p}(j-1)$
– Improvement at step i: $\beta(j) = \frac{\boldsymbol{g}(j)^H \boldsymbol{g}(j)}{\boldsymbol{g}(j-1)^H \boldsymbol{g}(j-1)}$
– Search direction: $\boldsymbol{p}(j) = \boldsymbol{g}(j) + \beta(j)\boldsymbol{p}(j-1)$



Fig. 1. Searching Direction of the CG Algorithm

B. Incremental Distributed CG–Based Solutions

In the incremental distributed strategy, each node is only allowed to communicate with its direct neighbor at each time instant. To describe the whole process, we define a cycle where each node in this network could only access its immediate neighbor in this cycle [1]. The quantity $\boldsymbol{\psi}_k(i)$ is defined as a local estimate of the unknown vector $\boldsymbol{\omega}_0$ at time instant i. As a result, we assume that node k has access to an estimate of $\boldsymbol{\omega}_0$ at its immediate neighbor node $k-1$ which is $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{k-1}(i)$ in the defined cycle. Fig.2 illustrates this processing.



Fig. 2. Incremental distributed CG–based network processing

In the following, we introduce two kinds of incremental distributed CG–based algorithms, which are the incremental distributed CCG (IDCCG) algorithm and the incremental distributed MCG (IDMCG) algorithm.

1) Proposed IDCCG Algorithm: Based on the main steps of CG algorithm which are described in Table. I, we introduce the main steps of the proposed IDCCG algorithm. In the IDCCG algorithm, the iteration procedure is introduced. At the jth iteration of time instant i, the step size $\alpha_k^j(i)$ for updating the local estimate at node k is defined as:

$$\alpha_k^j(i) = \frac{\left(\boldsymbol{g}_k^{j-1}(i)\right)^H \boldsymbol{g}_k^{j-1}(i)}{\left(\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i)\right)^H \boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i)}, \tag{12}$$

where $\boldsymbol{p}_k(i)$ is the search direction and defined as

$$\boldsymbol{p}_k^j(i) = \boldsymbol{g}_k^j(i) + \beta_k^j(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i). \tag{13}$$

In (13), the coefficient $\beta_k^j(i)$ is calculated by the Gram–Schmidt orthogonalization procedure [32] for the conjugacy:

$$\beta_k^j(i) = \frac{\left(\boldsymbol{g}_k^j(i)\right)^H \boldsymbol{g}_k^j(i)}{\left(\boldsymbol{g}_k^{j-1}(i)\right)^H \boldsymbol{g}_k^{j-1}(i)}. \tag{14}$$

$\boldsymbol{g}_k^j(i)$ is the residual, which is obtained as

$$\boldsymbol{g}_k^j(i) = \boldsymbol{g}_k^{j-1}(i) - \alpha_k^j(i)\boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i). \tag{15}$$

The initial search direction is equal to the initial residual, which is given by $\boldsymbol{p}_k^0(i) = \boldsymbol{g}_k^0(i) = \boldsymbol{b}_k(i) - \boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{\psi}_k^0(i)$. Then, the local estimate is updated as

$$\boldsymbol{\psi}_k^j(i) = \boldsymbol{\psi}_k^{j-1}(i) + \alpha_k^j(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i). \tag{16}$$

There are two ways to compute the correlation and cross–correlation matrices which are the 'finite sliding data window' and the 'exponentially decaying data window' [14]. In this paper, we mainly focus on the 'exponentially decaying data window'. The recursions are given by:

$$\boldsymbol{R}_k(i) = \lambda_f \boldsymbol{R}_k(i-1) + \boldsymbol{x}_k(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k^H(i) \tag{17}$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{b}_k(i) = \lambda_f \boldsymbol{b}_k(i-1) + d_k^*(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k(i) \tag{18}$$

where λ_f is the forgetting factor. The IDCCD algorithm is summarized in Table II

2) Proposed IDMCG Algorithm: The idea of the IDMCG algorithm comes from the existing CCG algorithm. For the IDMCG solution, a recursive formulation for the residual vector is employed, which can be found by using (12), (17) and (18) [14], [16], resulting in

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{g}_k(i) &= \boldsymbol{b}_k(i) - \boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{\psi}_k(i) \\ &= \lambda_f \boldsymbol{g}_k(i-1) - \alpha_k(i)\boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1) + \boldsymbol{x}_k(i)[d_k(i) - \boldsymbol{\psi}_{k-1}^H(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k(i)]. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

TABLE II

IDCCG ALGORITHM

Initialization:

$\boldsymbol{\omega}(0) = \mathbf{0}$

For each time instant i=1,2, …, I

$\boldsymbol{\psi}_1^0(i) = \boldsymbol{\omega}(i-1)$

For each node k=1,2, …, N

$\boldsymbol{R}_k(i) = \lambda_f \boldsymbol{R}_k(i-1) + \boldsymbol{x}_k(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k^H(i)$

$\boldsymbol{b}_k(i) = \lambda_f \boldsymbol{b}_k(i-1) + d_k^*(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k(i)$

$\boldsymbol{p}_k^0(i) = \boldsymbol{g}_k^0(i) = \boldsymbol{b}_k(i) - \boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{\psi}_k^0(i)$

For iterations j=1,2, …, J

$\alpha_k^j(i) = \frac{\left(\boldsymbol{g}_k^{j-1}(i)\right)^H \boldsymbol{g}_k^{j-1}(i)}{\left(\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i)\right)^H \boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i)}$

$\boldsymbol{\psi}_k^j(i) = \boldsymbol{\psi}_k^{j-1}(i) + \alpha_k^j(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i)$

$\boldsymbol{g}_k^j(i) = \boldsymbol{g}_k^{j-1}(i) - \alpha_k^j(i)\boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i)$

$\beta_k^j(i) = \frac{\left(\boldsymbol{g}_k^j(i)\right)^H \boldsymbol{g}_k^j(i)}{\left(\boldsymbol{g}_k^{j-1}(i)\right)^H \boldsymbol{g}_k^{j-1}(i)}$

$\boldsymbol{p}_k^j(i) = \boldsymbol{g}_k^j(i) + \beta_k^j(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i)$

End

When $k < N$

$\boldsymbol{\psi}_{k+1}^0(i) = \boldsymbol{\psi}_k^J(i)$

End

$\boldsymbol{\omega}(i) = \boldsymbol{\psi}_N^J(i)$

End

Premultiplying (19) by $\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i) = \lambda_f \boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i-1) - \alpha_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1)\\ + \boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{x}_k(i)[d_k(i) - \boldsymbol{\psi}_{k-1}^H(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k(i)].\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Taking the expectation of both sides and considering $\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1)$ uncorrelated with $\boldsymbol{x}_k(i)$, $d_k(i)$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{k-1}(i)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i)] \approx \lambda_f \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1)^H \boldsymbol{g}_{k-1}(i)] - \mathbb{E}[\alpha_k(i)]\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1)]\\ + \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)]\mathbb{E}\big[\boldsymbol{x}_k(i)[d_k(i) - \boldsymbol{\omega}_{k-1}^H(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k(i)]\big].\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Assuming that the algorithm converges, the last term of (21) could be neglected and we will obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}[\alpha_k(i)] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i)] - \lambda_f \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i-1)]}{\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1)]} \tag{22}$$

and

$$(\lambda_f - 0.5)\frac{\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i-1)]}{\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1)]} \leq \mathbb{E}[\alpha_k(i)] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i-1)]}{\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1)]} \tag{23}$$

TABLE III

IDMCG ALGORITHM

Initialization:

$\boldsymbol{\omega}(0) = \mathbf{0}$

For each node k=1,2, …, N

$\boldsymbol{b}_k(1) = d_k^*(1)\boldsymbol{x}_k(1)$

$\boldsymbol{p}_k(0) = \boldsymbol{g}_k(0) = \boldsymbol{b}_k(1)$

End

For each time instant i=1,2, …, I

$\boldsymbol{\psi}_0(i) = \boldsymbol{\omega}(i-1)$

For each node k=1,2, …, N

$\boldsymbol{R}_k(i) = \lambda_f \boldsymbol{R}_k(i-1) + \boldsymbol{x}_k(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k^H(i)$

$\alpha_k(i) = \eta \frac{\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i-1)}{\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1)}$

where $(\lambda_f - 0.5) \leq \eta \leq \lambda_f$

$\boldsymbol{\psi}_k(i) = \boldsymbol{\psi}_{k-1}(i) + \alpha_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1)$

$\boldsymbol{g}_k(i) = \lambda_f \boldsymbol{g}_k(i-1) - \alpha_k(i)\boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1) + \boldsymbol{x}_k(i)[d_k(i) - \boldsymbol{\psi}_{k-1}^H(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k(i)]$

$\beta_k(i) = \frac{\left(\boldsymbol{g}_k(i) - \boldsymbol{g}_k^H(i-1)\right)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i)}{\boldsymbol{g}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i-1)}$

$\boldsymbol{p}_k(i) = \boldsymbol{g}_k(i) + \beta_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1)$

End

$\boldsymbol{\omega}(i) = \boldsymbol{\psi}_N(i)$

End

The inequalities in (23) are satisfied if we define [14]:

$$\alpha_k(i) = \eta \frac{\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i-1)}{\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1)}, \tag{24}$$

where $(\lambda_f - 0.5) \leq \eta \leq \lambda_f$. The direction vector $\boldsymbol{p}_k(i)$ for the IDMCG algorithm is defined by

$$\boldsymbol{p}_k(i) = \boldsymbol{g}_k(i) + \beta_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1). \tag{25}$$

For the IDMCG algorithm, for the computation of $\beta_k(i)$, the Polak–Ribiere method [14], which is given by

$$\beta_k(i) = \frac{\left(\boldsymbol{g}_k(i) - \boldsymbol{g}_k^H(i-1)\right)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i)}{\boldsymbol{g}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i-1)} \tag{26}$$

should be used for improved performance, according to [33], [34].

In the comparison of the IDCCG algorithm with the IDMCG algorithm, the difference between these two strategies is that IDCCG needs to run J iterations while IDMCG only needs one iteration. The details of the IDMCG solution is shown in Table III.

TABLE IV

COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY OF DIFFERENT INCREMENTAL ALGORITHMS

Algorithm	Additions	Multiplications
IDCCG	M^2+M $+J(M^2+6M-4)$	$2M^2+2M$ $J(M^2+7M+3)$
IDMCG	$2M^2+10M-4$	$3M^2+12M+3$
Incremental LMS [1]	$4M-1$	$3M+1$
Incremental RLS [1]	$4M^2+12M+1$	$4M^2+12M-1$

C. Computational Complexity

To analyze the proposed incremental distributed CG algorithms, we detail the computational complexity in terms of arithmetic operations. Additions and multiplications are used to measure the complexity and are listed in Table IV. The parameter M is the length of the unknown vector $\boldsymbol{\omega}_0$ that needs to be estimated. It is obvious that the complexity of the IDCCG solution depends on the number of iterations J and an advantage of the IDMCG algorithm is that it only requires one iteration per time instant.

IV. PROPOSED DIFFUSION DISTRIBUTED CG–BASED ALGORITHMS

In this section, we detail the proposed diffusion distributed CCG (DDCCG) and diffusion distributed MCG (DDMCG) algorithms for distributed parameter estimation and spectrum estimation using wireless sensor networks.

A. Diffusion Distributed CG–Based Algorithms

In the derivation of diffusion distributed CG–based strategy, we consider a network structure where each node from the same neighborhood could exchange information with each other at every time instant. For each node in the network, the CTA scheme [35] is employed. Each node can collect information from all its neighbors and itself, and then convey all the information to its local adaptive algorithm and update the estimate of the weight vector through our algorithms. Specifically, at any time instant i, we define that node k has access to a set of estimates $\{\boldsymbol{\omega}_l(i-1)\}_{l\in\mathcal{N}_k}$ from its neighbors, where N_k denotes the set of neighbor nodes of node k including node k itself. Then, these local estimates are combined at node k as

$$\boldsymbol{\psi}_k(i)=\sum_{l\in\mathcal{N}_k} c_{kl}\boldsymbol{\omega}_l(i-1) \tag{27}$$

where c_{kl} is the combining coefficient. There are many ways to calculate the combining coefficient c_{kl} which include the Hastings [36], the Metropolis [37], the Laplacian [38] and the nearest neighbor [39] rules. In this paper,

due to its simplicity and good performance [36] we adopt the Metropolis rule given by

$$c_{kl} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{max\{|\mathcal{N}_k|,|\mathcal{N}_l|\}}, & \text{if } k \neq l \text{ are linked} \\ 1 - \sum\limits_{l \in \mathcal{N}_k/k} c_{kl}, & \text{for } k = l, \end{cases} \tag{28}$$

where $|\mathcal{N}_k|$ denotes the cardinality of $\mathcal{N}_k$. The combining coefficients c_{kl} should satisfy

$$\sum_{l \in \mathcal{N}_k \forall k} c_{kl} = 1. \tag{29}$$

For the proposed diffusion distributed CG–based algorithms, the whole processing is shown in Fig. 3.



Fig. 3. Diffusion Distributed CG–Based Network Processing

1) Proposed DDCCG Algorithm: For the DDCCG algorithm, (27) is employed to combine the estimates $\boldsymbol{\omega}_l(i-1), l \in \mathcal{N}_k$ from node k's neighbor nodes and then the estimate at node k is updated as:

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}_k^j(i) = \boldsymbol{\omega}_k^{j-1}(i) + \alpha_k^j(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i), \tag{30}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\omega}_k^0(i) = \boldsymbol{\psi}_k(i)$. The rest of the derivation is similar to the IDCCG solution and the pseudo–code is detailed in Table V.

2) Proposed DDMCG Algorithm: For the DDMCG algorithm, the iteration j is removed and the estimate at node k is updated as:

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}_k(i) = \boldsymbol{\psi}_k(i) + \alpha_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i), \tag{31}$$

The complete DDMCG solution is described in Table VI.

B. Computational Complexity

The computational complexity is used to analyse the proposed diffusion distributed CG–based algorithms where additions and multiplications are measured. The details are listed in Table VII. Similarly to the incremental distributed CG–based algorithms, it is clear that the complexity of the DDCCG solution depends on the iteration

TABLE V

DDCCG ALGORITHM

Initialization:

$\boldsymbol{\omega}_k(0) = \mathbf{0}$, k=1,2, …, N

For each time instant i=1,2, …, I

For each node k=1,2, …, N (Combination Step)

$$\boldsymbol{\psi}_k(i) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{N}_k} c_{kl} \boldsymbol{\omega}_l(i-1)$$

End

For each node k=1,2, …, N (Adaptation Step)

$$\boldsymbol{R}_k(i) = \lambda_f \boldsymbol{R}_k(i-1) + \boldsymbol{x}_k(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k^H(i)$$

$$\boldsymbol{b}_k(i) = \lambda_f \boldsymbol{b}_k(i-1) + d_k^*(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k(i)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}_k^0(i) = \boldsymbol{\psi}_k(i)$$

$$\boldsymbol{p}_k^0(i) = \boldsymbol{g}_k^0(i) = \boldsymbol{b}_k(i) - \boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{\omega}_k^0(i)$$

For iterations j=1,2, …, J

$$\alpha_k^j(i) = \frac{\left(\boldsymbol{g}_k^{j-1}(i)\right)^H \boldsymbol{g}_k^{j-1}(i)}{\left(\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i)\right)^H \boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i)}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}_k^j(i) = \boldsymbol{\omega}_k^{j-1}(i) + \alpha_k^j(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i)$$

$$\boldsymbol{g}_k^j(i) = \boldsymbol{g}_k^{j-1}(i) - \alpha_k^j(i)\boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i)$$

$$\beta_k^j(i) = \frac{\left(\boldsymbol{g}_k^j(i)\right)^H \boldsymbol{g}_k^j(i)}{\left(\boldsymbol{g}_k^{j-1}(i)\right)^H \boldsymbol{g}_k^{j-1}(i)}$$

$$\boldsymbol{p}_k^j(i) = \boldsymbol{g}_k^j(i) + \beta_k^j(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k^{j-1}(i)$$

End

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}_k(i) = \boldsymbol{\omega}_k^J(i)$$

End

End

number J and both DDCCG and DDMCG solutions depend on the number of neighbor nodes $|\mathcal{N}_k|$ of node k. The parameter M is the length of the unknown vector $\boldsymbol{\omega}_0$ that needs to be estimated.

V. PRECONDITIONER DESIGN

Preconditioning is an important technique which can be used to improve the performance of CG algorithms [40], [41], [42], [43]. The idea behind preconditioning is to employ the CG algorithms on an equivalent system or in a transform–domain. Thus, instead of solving $\boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{\omega} = \boldsymbol{b}$ we solve a related problem $\tilde{\boldsymbol{R}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{b}}$, which is modified with the aim of obtaining better convergence and steady state performances. The relationships between these two equations are given by

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{R}} = \boldsymbol{T}\boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{T}^H, \tag{32}$$

TABLE VI

DDMCG ALGORITHM

Initialization:

$\boldsymbol{\omega}_k(0) = \mathbf{0}, k$=1,2, …, N

For each node k=1,2, …, N

$\boldsymbol{b}_k(1) = d_k^*(1)\boldsymbol{x}_k(1)$

$\boldsymbol{p}_k(0) = \boldsymbol{g}_k(0) = \boldsymbol{b}_k(1)$

End

For each time instant i=1,2, …, I

For each node k=1,2, …, N (Combination Step)

$\boldsymbol{\psi}_k(i) = \sum_{l\in\mathcal{N}_k} c_{kl}\boldsymbol{\omega}_l(i-1)$

End

For each node k=1,2, …, N (Adaptation Step)

$\boldsymbol{R}_k(i) = \lambda_f \boldsymbol{R}_k(i-1) + \boldsymbol{x}_k(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k^H(i)$

$\boldsymbol{b}_k(i) = \lambda_f \boldsymbol{b}_k(i-1) + d_k^*(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k(i)$

$\alpha_k(i) = \eta\frac{\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i-1)}{\boldsymbol{p}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1)}$

where $(\lambda_f - 0.5) \le \eta \le \lambda_f$

$\boldsymbol{\omega}_k(i) = \boldsymbol{\psi}_k(i) + \alpha_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1)$

$\boldsymbol{g}_k(i) = \lambda_f \boldsymbol{g}_k(i-1) - \alpha_k(i)\boldsymbol{R}_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1) + \boldsymbol{x}_k(i)[d_k(i) - \boldsymbol{\psi}_{k-1}^H(i)\boldsymbol{x}_k(i)]$

$\beta_k(i) = \frac{\left(\boldsymbol{g}_k(i) - \boldsymbol{g}_k^H(i-1)\right)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i)}{\boldsymbol{g}_k^H(i-1)\boldsymbol{g}_k(i-1)}$

$\boldsymbol{p}_k(i) = \boldsymbol{g}_k(i) + \beta_k(i)\boldsymbol{p}_k(i-1)$

End

End

TABLE VII

COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY OF DIFFERENT DIFFUSION ALGORITHMS

Algorithm	Additions	Multiplications
DDCCG	$M^2 + M$ $+J(M^2 + 6M$ $+\lvert\mathcal{N}_k\rvert M - 4)$	$2M^2 + 2M$ $+J(M^2 + 7M$ $+\lvert\mathcal{N}_k\rvert M + 3)$
DDMCG	$2M^2 + 10M - 4$ $+\lvert\mathcal{N}_k\rvert M$	$3M^2 + 12M + 3$ $+\lvert\mathcal{N}_k\rvert M$
Diffusion LMS [35]	$4M - 1 + \lvert\mathcal{N}_k\rvert M$	$3M + 1 + \lvert\mathcal{N}_k\rvert M$
Diffusion RLS [6]	$4M^2 + 16M + 1 + \lvert\mathcal{N}_k\rvert M$	$4M^2 + 12M - 1 + \lvert\mathcal{N}_k\rvert M$

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}} = \boldsymbol{T}\boldsymbol{\omega} \tag{33}$$

and

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{b}} = \boldsymbol{T}\boldsymbol{b}, \tag{34}$$

where the $M \times M$ matrix $\boldsymbol{T}$ is called a preconditioner. We design the matrix $\boldsymbol{T}$ as an arbitrary unitary matrix of size $M \times M$ and has the following property [44]

$$\boldsymbol{T}\boldsymbol{T}^H = \boldsymbol{T}^H\boldsymbol{T} = \boldsymbol{I}. \tag{35}$$

Two kinds of unitary transformations are considered to build the preconditioner $\boldsymbol{T}$, which are discrete Fourier transform (DFT) and discrete cosine transform (DCT) [44]. The motivation behind employing these two matrix is they have useful de–correlation properties and often reduce the eigenvalue spread of the auto–correlation matrix of the input signal [44].

For the DFT scheme, we employ the following expression

$$[\boldsymbol{T}_{DFT}]_{vm} \triangleq \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} e^{-\frac{j2\pi mv}{M}}, \quad v, m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, M-1, \tag{36}$$

where v indicates the row index and m the column index. M is the length of the unknown parameter $\boldsymbol{\omega}_0$. The matrix form of $\boldsymbol{T}_{DFT}$ is illustrated as

$$\boldsymbol{T}_{DFT} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & e^{-\frac{j2\pi}{M}} & e^{-\frac{j4\pi}{M}} & \cdots & e^{-\frac{j2(M-1)\pi}{M}} \\ 1 & e^{-\frac{j4\pi}{M}} & e^{-\frac{j8\pi}{M}} & \cdots & e^{-\frac{j4(M-1)\pi}{M}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & e^{-\frac{j2(M-1)\pi}{M}} & e^{-\frac{j4(M-1)\pi}{M}} & \cdots & e^{-\frac{j2(M-1)^2\pi}{M}} \end{bmatrix} \tag{37}$$

For the DCT scheme, the preconditioner $\boldsymbol{T}$ is defined as

$$[\boldsymbol{T}_{DCT}]_{vm} \triangleq \delta(v) \cos\left(\frac{v(2m+1)\pi}{2M}\right), \quad v, m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, M-1, \tag{38}$$

where

$$\delta(0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(v) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{M}} \text{ for } v \neq 0 \tag{39}$$

and the matrix form of $\boldsymbol{T}_{DCT}$ is illustrated as

$$\boldsymbol{T}_{DCT} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & \sqrt{2}\cos(\frac{3\pi}{2M}) & \sqrt{2}\cos(\frac{5\pi}{2M}) & \cdots & \sqrt{2}\cos(\frac{(2M-1)\pi}{2M}) \\ 1 & \sqrt{2}\cos(\frac{6\pi}{2M}) & \sqrt{2}\cos(\frac{10\pi}{2M}) & \cdots & \sqrt{2}\cos(\frac{2(2M-1)\pi}{2M}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \sqrt{2}\cos(\frac{3(M-1)\pi}{2M}) & \sqrt{2}\cos(\frac{5(M-1)\pi}{2M}) & \cdots & \sqrt{2}\cos(\frac{(2M-1)(M-1)\pi}{2M}) \end{bmatrix} \tag{40}$$

Then, for the DCT scheme, we choose $\boldsymbol{T} = \boldsymbol{T}_{DCT}^{H}$. It should be noticed that the scaling factor $\frac{1}{\sqrt{M}}$ is added in the expression for the $\boldsymbol{T}_{DFT}$ in order to result in a unitary transformation since then $\boldsymbol{T}_{DFT}$ satisfies $\boldsymbol{T}_{DFT}\boldsymbol{T}_{DFT}^{H} = \boldsymbol{T}_{DFT}^{H}\boldsymbol{T}_{DFT} = \boldsymbol{I}$ [44].

The optimal selection of the preconditioner is the Kahunen–Loève transform (KLT) [44]. However, using KLT is not practical since it requires knowledge of the auto–correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{R}$ of the input signal and this information is generally lacking in implementations.

VI. Simulation Results

In this section, we investigate the performance of the proposed incremental and diffusion distributed CG–based algorithms in two scenarios: distributed estimation and distributed spectrum estimation in wireless sensor networks.

A. Distributed Estimation in Wireless Sensor Networks

In this subsection, we compare the proposed incremental and diffusion distributed CG–based algorithms with LMS [1], [35] and RLS [1], [6] algorithms, based on the MSE and MSD performance metrics. For each comparison, the number of time instants is set to 1000, and we assume there are 20 nodes in the network. The length of the unknown parameter $\boldsymbol{\omega}_0$ is 10, the variance for the input signal and the noise are 1 and 0.001, respectively. In addition, the noise samples are modeled as circular Gaussian noise with zero mean.

1) Performance of Proposed Incremental Distributed CG–Based Algorithms: First, we define the parameters of the performance test for each algorithm and the network. The step size μ for the LMS algorithm [1] is set to 0.005, the forgetting factor λ for the RLS [1] algorithm is set to 0.998. The λ_f for IDCCG and IDMCG are both set to 0.998. For IDMCG, the η_f is equal to 0.55. The iteration number J for IDCCG is set to 5. We choose the DCT matrix as the preconditioner.

The MSD and MSE performances of each algorithm have been shown in Fig. 4 and 5 respectively. We can verify that, the IDMCG and IDCCG algorithm performs better than incremental LMS, while IDMCG is close to the RLS

algorithm. With the preconditioning strategy, the performance of the IDCCG and IDMCG is further improved. The reason why the proposed IDMCG algorithm has a better performance than IDCCG is because IDMCG employs the negative gradient vector $\boldsymbol{g}_k$ with a recursive expression and the β_k is computed using the Polak–Ribiere approach, which results in more accurate estimates. Comparing with the IDCCG algorithm, the IDMCG is a non–reset and low complexity algorithm with one iteration per time instant. Since the frequency which the algorithm resets influences the performance, the IDMCG algorithm introduces the non–reset method together with the Polak– Ribiere approach which are used to improve the performance [14].



Fig. 4. MSD performance comparison for the incremental distributed strategies

2) Performance of Proposed Diffusion Distributed CG–Based Algorithms: The parameters of the performance test for each algorithm and the network are defined as follows: the step size μ for the LMS [35] algorithm is set to 0.045, the forgetting factor λ for the RLS [6] algorithm is set to 0.998. The λ_f for DDCCG and DDMCG are both 0.998. The η_f is equal to 0.45 for DDMCG. The iteration number J for DDCCG is set to 5. We choose the DCT matrix as the preconditioner.

For the diffusion strategy, the combine coefficients c_{kl} are calculated following the Metropolis rule. Fig. 6 shows the network structure. The results are illustrated in Fig. 7 and 8. We can see that, the proposed DDMCG and DDCCG still have a better performance than the LMS algorithm and DDMCG is closer to the RLS's performance. The performance of the DDCCG and DDMCG can still benefit from the preconditioning strategy.



Fig. 5. MSE performance comparison for the incremental distributed strategies



Fig. 6. Network structure

B. Distributed Spectrum Estimation

In this simulation, we consider a network composed of $N = 20$ nodes estimating the unknown spectrum $\boldsymbol{\omega}_0$, as illustrated in Fig. 6. The nodes scan $N_c = 100$ frequencies over the frequency axis, which is normalized between 0 and 1, and use $\mathcal{B} = 50$ non–overlapping rectangular basis functions to model the expansion of the spectrum [45].



Fig. 7. MSD performance comparison for the diffusion distributed strategies



Fig. 8. MSE performance comparison for the diffusion distributed strategies

The basis functions have amplitude equal to one. We assume that the unknown spectrum ω_0 is transmitted over 8 basis functions, thus leading to a sparsity ratio equal to 8/50. The power transmitted over each basis function is set equal to 1.

For distributed estimation, we employ the DDMCG and the DDCCG algorithms, together with the preconditioned

DDMCG algorithm to solve the cost function (11) respectively. The λ_f for DDCCG and DDMCG are both 0.99. The η_f is equal to 0.3 for DDMCG. The iteration number J for DDCCG is set to 5. The DCT matrix is employed as the preconditioner. We compare the proposed DDCCG and DDMCG algorithms with the sparse ATC diffusion algorithm [45], diffusion LMS algorithm [35] and diffusion RLS algorithm [6]. The step–sizes for the sparse ATC diffusion algorithm and diffusion LMS algorithm are set equal to 0.05, while for the sparse ATC diffusion algorithm, γ is set to $2.2 \times 10^{-}3$ and β is set to 50. The forgetting factor λ for the diffusion RLS algorithm is set to 0.998.

We illustrate the result of distributed spectrum estimation carried out by different algorithms in the term of the MSD comparison in Fig. 9. We also select the sparse ATC diffusion algorithm [45], diffusion LMS algorithm [35] and DDMCG to compare their performance in term of PSD in Fig. 10. The true transmitted spectrum is also reported in Fig. 10.



Fig. 9. Performance comparison for the distributed spectrum estimation

From Fig. 9, the DDMCG still performs better than other algorithms and is close to the diffusion RLS algorithm. From Fig. 10, we can notice that all the algorithms are able to identify the spectrum, but it is also clear that the DDMCG algorithm is able to strongly reduce the effect of the spurious terms.

VII. Conclusions

In this paper, we have proposed distributed CG algorithms for both incremental and diffusion adaptive strategies. We have investigated the proposed algorithms in distributed estimation for wireless sensor networks and distributed



Fig. 10. Example of distributed spectrum estimation

spectrum estimation. The CG–based strategies has low computational complexity when compared with the RLS algorithm and have a faster convergence than the LMS algorithm. The preconditioning strategy is also introduced to further improve the performance of the proposed algorithms. Simulation results have proved the advantages of the proposed IDCCG/IDMCG and DDCCG/DDMCG algorithms in different applications.

REFERENCES

[1] C. G. Lopes and A. H. Sayed, "Incremental adaptive strategies over distributed networks," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 48, no. 8, pp. 223–229, Aug 2007.

[2] A. H. Sayed and C. G. Lopes, "Adaptive processing over distributed networks," *IEICE Trans. Fundam. Electron. Commun. Comput. Sci.*, vol. E90-A, no. 8, pp. 1504–1510, August 2007.

[3] A. Sayed and C. Lopes, "Distributed recursive least-squares strategies over adaptive networks," in *Fortieth Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, October 2006, pp. 233–237.

[4] L. Li and J. A. Chambers, "Distributed adaptive estimation based on the APA algorithm over diffusion networks with changing topology," *in Proc. IEEE Statist. Signal Process. Workshop*, pp. 757–760, Cardiff, Wales, September 2009.

[5] C. G. Lopes and A. H. Sayed, "Diffusion least–mean squares over adaptive networks: Formulation and performance analysis," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 56, no. 7, pp. 3122–3136, July 2008.

[6] F. Cattivelli, C. Lopes, and A. Sayed, "Diffusion recursive least-squares for distributed estimation over adaptive networks," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 1865–1877, May 2008.

[7] S. Xu, R. C. de Lamare, and H. V. Poor, "Adaptive link selection strategies for distributed estimation in diffusion wireless networks," in *Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2013 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 5402–5405.

[8] ——, "Dynamic topology adaptation for distributed estimation in smart grids," in *Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing (CAMSAP), 2013 IEEE 5th International Workshop on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 420–423.

[9] G. Mateos, I. D. Schizas, and G. B. Giannakis, "Distributed Recursive Least-Squares for Consensus-Based In-Network Adaptive Estimation," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 57, no. 11, pp. 4583–4588, November 2009.

[10] S. Xu, R. C. de Lamare, and H. V. Poor, "Adaptive link selection algorithms for distributed estimation," *EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing*, vol. 2015, no. 1, pp. 1–22, 2015.

[11] ——, "Distributed compressed estimation based on compressive sensing," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 22, no. 9, pp. 1311–1315, 2015.

[12] M. Abadi and Z. Saffari, "Distributed estimation over an adaptive diffusion network based on the family of affine projection algorithms," in *)Sixth International Symposium on Telecommunications (IST*, November 2012, pp. 607–611.

[13] S. Xu, R. C. de Lamare, and H. V. Poor, "Distributed reduced-rank estimation based on joint iterative optimization in sensor networks," in *2014 Proceedings of the 22nd European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 2360–2364.

[14] P. S. Chang and J. A.N. Willson, "Analysis of conjugate gradient algorithms for adaptive filtering," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 409–418, February 2000.

[15] ——, "Adaptive filtering using modified conjugate gradient," in *Proceedings., Proceedings of the 38th Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, vol. 1, August 1995, pp. 243–246.

[16] L. Wang and R. de Lamare, "Constrained adaptive filtering algorithms based on conjugate gradient techniques for beamforming," *IET Signal Processing*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 686–697, December 2010.

[17] R. Fa, R. C. de Lamare, and L. Wang, "Reduced-rank stap schemes for airborne radar based on switched joint interpolation, decimation and filtering algorithm," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 8, pp. 4182–4194, 2010.

[18] R. C. de Lamare and R. Sampaio-Neto, "Adaptive reduced-rank processing based on joint and iterative interpolation, decimation and filtering," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 57, no. 7, pp. 2503–2514, July 2009.

[19] S. Haykin, *Adaptive Filter Theory*, 4th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall, 2002.

[20] O. Axelsson, *Iterative Solution Methods*. New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

[21] A. Bertrand and M. Moonen, "Distributed adaptive node–specific signal estimation in fully connected sensor networks–part II: Simultaneous and asynchronous node updating," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 58, no. 10, pp. 5292–5306, 2010.

[22] J. Bazerque and G. Giannakis, "Distributed spectrum sensing for cognitive radio networks by exploiting sparsity," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 1847–1862, March 2010.

[23] S. Chen, D. L. Donoho, and M. A. Saunders, "Atomic decomposition by basis pursuit," *SIAM JOURNAL ON SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING*, vol. 20, pp. 33–61, 1998.

[24] Y. Zakharov, T. Tozer, and J. Adlard, "Polynomial spline–approximation of clarke's model," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 1198–1208, May 2004.

[25] R. C. de Lamare and R. Sampaio-Neto, "Adaptive reduced-rank mmse filtering with interpolated fir filters and adaptive interpolators," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 177–180, 2005.

[26] ——, "Reduced-rank adaptive filtering based on joint iterative optimization of adaptive filters," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 14, no. 12, pp. 980–983, 2007.

[27] R. C. de Lamare, M. Haardt, and R. Sampaio-Neto, "Blind adaptive constrained reduced-rank parameter estimation based on constant modulus design for cdma interference suppression," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Processing*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 2470–2482, 2008.

[28] R. C. de Lamare and R. Sampaio-Neto, "Reduced-rank space–time adaptive interference suppression with joint iterative least squares algorithms for spread-spectrum systems," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 1217–1228, 2010.

[29] ——, "Adaptive reduced-rank equalization algorithms based on alternating optimization design techniques for mimo systems," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 2482–2494, 2011.

[30] N. Song, R. C. de Lamare, M. Haardt, and M. Wolf, "Adaptive widely linear reduced-rank interference suppression based on the multistage wiener filter," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 60, no. 8, pp. 4003–4016, 2012.

[31] T. Peng, R. C. de Lamare, and A. Schmeink, "Adaptive distributed space-time coding based on adjustable code matrices for cooperative mimo relaying systems," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 61, no. 7, pp. 2692–2703, 2013.

[32] G. H. Golub and C. F. V. Loan, *Matrix Computations*, 3rd ed. Baltimore, MD, USA: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

[33] R. Fletcher, *Practical Methods of Optimization*, 2nd ed. Chichester, U.K.: Wiley, 1987.

[34] D. F. Shanno, "Conjugate gradient methods with inexact searches," *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 244–256, 1978.

[35] F. S. Cattivelli and A. H. Sayed, "Diffusion LMS strategies for distributed estimation," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 58, p. 10351048, March 2010.

[36] X. Zhao and A. H. Sayed, "Performance limits for distributed estimation over lms adaptive networks," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 5107–5124, October 2012.

[37] L. Xiao and S. Boyd, "Fast linear iterations for distributed averaging," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 65–78, September 2004.

[38] R. Olfati-Saber and R. M. Murray, "Consensus problems in networks of agents with switching topology and time-delays," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.*, vol. 49, pp. 1520–1533, September 2004.

[39] A. Jadbabaie, J. Lin, and A. S. Morse, "Coordination of groups of mobile autonomous agents using nearest neighbor rules," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 988–1001, June 2003.

[40] M. Benzi, "Preconditioning techniques for large linear systems: A survey," *Journal of Computational Physics*, vol. 182, no. 2, pp. 418–477, 2002.

[41] S. C. Eisenstat, "Efficient implementation of a class of preconditioned conjugate gradient methods," *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–4, 1981.

[42] A. V. Knyazev, "Toward the optimal preconditioned eigensolver: Locally optimal block preconditioned conjugate gradient method," *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 517–541, 2001.

[43] O. Axelsson and G. Lindskog, "On the rate of convergence of the preconditioned conjugate gradient method," *Numerische Mathematik*, vol. 48, no. 5, pp. 499–523, 1986.

[44] A. H. Sayed, *Fundamentals of Adaptive Filtering*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley&Sons, 2003.

[45] P. D. Lorenzo, S. Barbarossa, and A. Sayed, "Distributed spectrum estimation for small cell networks based on sparse diffusion adaptation," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 20, no. 12, pp. 1261–1265, Dec 2013.